



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

employed this means were not less animated by the imperial instinct than those who did similar work on the continent. The much-lauded Teutonic principle of local self-government, left to itself, would have maintained or still further subdivided the Heptarchy. Feudalizing particularism was practically triumphant in England when the strong family of the Bastard established a stern but wholesome central power. There was no federalism in the Norman principle; whatever the theory, that principle was in fact imperial; and as such it made England, as we know it, possible. This is the point which is apt to be slighted by the admirers of Teutonism, and it is this thought which must be carefully kept in mind by the reader of Mr. Taylor's book. It must be said, however, that the author's treatment of the Norman period and of the royal power as then established is in the main very fair and is certainly very interesting. The promise of ultra-Teutonism which appears in his introduction is scarcely fulfilled in the body of the work.

The grand divisions of the present volume are entitled "The Old-English Commonwealth," "The Norman Conquest" and "The Growth and Decline of Parliament." In the last section is given a summary and a prospective view, in which latter the second volume is outlined so far as it pertains to parliamentary history in England. What the author's views of the United States constitution are to be is not disclosed. The two volumes promise to form an exceedingly useful compendium of constitutional history. The value of the first for reference is much enhanced by an elaborate analysis of the contents. As to the general accuracy of Mr. Taylor's statements no fault can be found, though an inexcusable error appears on the fourth page. Aristotle is there made to express the opinion that "the state differs from the household only as to the number of its members." A little care would have revealed that Aristotle mentions this as a doctrine of certain philosophers (meaning Plato), declares it to be a false doctrine ("ταῦτα δ' οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθῆ"), and enters into his famous analysis of the household to prove that it is false.

W.M. A. DUNNING.

Speech before the Parnell Commission. By Sir CHARLES RUSSELL, Q.C., M.P. London and New York, Macmillan & Co., 1889.—xii, 615 pp.

Scientific treatment of a great public question can scarcely be looked for in the plea of an advocate; yet in this substantial volume, which contains Sir Charles Russell's opening speech for the defence, the student of Irish history may find invaluable material for the elucidation of existing problems. While it must be borne in mind that but one side of a great controversy is presented, immense aid is to be derived for com-

prehending the whole from the clear and systematic form in which the brilliant pleader has arranged the part. Supplemented by the address of Sir Henry James on behalf of *The Times*, nothing more will be necessary for an intelligent judgment on the present relations of England and Ireland.

Mr. Parnell's counsel at the outset protests against the apparent assumption by his adversaries that the agitation which took form in the Land League of 1879 is an isolated phenomenon, to be investigated and judged without reference to earlier history. On the basis of this protest, a hundred pages of his address are devoted to an historical survey of Irish agrarian and political agitation. He makes it perfectly clear (and, with a lawyer's adroitness, largely by quotations from Tory sources) that there was nothing unprecedented either in the causes, the results or the forms of the disturbances which characterized the period of Land-League activity. Substantially all that can be declared novel in this period is the more open and constitutional organization adopted, in name at least, by the seekers after agrarian reform, as contrasted with the secret and revolutionary combinations which, in reference to that object, always hitherto prevailed. There is of course much mere assertion, for which evidence is promised, as to the relation between agitation and crime. Whether the influence of the league or the application of coercion laws is responsible for the astonishing fluctuations in crime which the statistics reveal, is a central point of contention now, as it always has been, between the opposing factions. But one fact stands out beyond question,—and Sir Charles does not fail to present it in its most effective form,—that if professed ends can justify the means, the Land League of 1879 is justified; for practically all its demands of a decade ago are to-day embodied in the statutes of the realm. The counsel's plea in connection with the matter is worth quoting, both as well expressing a pregnant fact and as illustrating the tone of fairness which pervades the whole speech. After quoting a declaration of Mr. Chamberlain that the action of the Land League made possible the remedial measures of 1881 and succeeding years, he says:

And what does that mean? My Lords, it points to a grievous vice in our political system. It does not mean—I have never thought it, I have never said it—it did not mean that honest men who have their attention called to the wretched state of Ireland and who form the representation of Scotland, England and Wales are not anxious according to their view to do their duty; but it means that there is a *vis inertiae* prevailing in the legislature in relation to Irish questions, partly caused by the pressure of, as it is thought, more important concerns, partly from want of information, partly from class interests, partly from prejudice, until it is literally true to say that, go over the last hundred years and trace the story of its remedial legislation, and you will find

that there is hardly one, if there be one, of the measures of that character which are to be found on the statute book which has come as a free-will offering of the legislature and which has not come as the result of agitation, sometimes constitutional, sometimes unconstitutional, but always after pressure.

Only four out of the twenty-three chapters in the book are so closely devoted to the case proper as to lose interest for the reader who has not familiarized himself with the evidence. Outside of these and the part relating to affairs before 1879, the speech offers the best extant history of the whole Parnell movement from the Parnell standpoint. There is a tone of moderation and sweet reasonableness about the presentation which is in winning contrast with the hysterical productions of other writers on the same side. The reader may not be altogether convinced that the great Parnellite associations have been unmitigated blessings ; he may not be absolutely certain that the Irish leaders were as discreet as possible in their dealings with the "physical force" element among their followers ; but he will feel, on laying down the book, that in the choice of leading counsel in the controversy with *The Times* a type of practical wisdom was displayed which could have no higher eulogy than the work before him.

Wm. A. DUNNING.